



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

power, by a learned and sagacious historical consideration of English, Continental, and colonial precedents. Mr. Coxe fully admits the fact that at the period when our constitutions were made, the theory of parliamentary omnipotence was well established. But he points out that this had not always been so; and the older precedents, relating to the Church and the royal prerogative, show that English law had once been no stranger to the doctrine that an Act of the highest legislature might be judicially held invalid.

In considering the great colonial case of *Winthrop v. Lechemere*, it appears to us that Mr. Coxe abandons quite too readily the view that it involved a *judicial* declaration of the invalidity of the colonial Act. But there is not space to give the reasons for that opinion.

The author deserves thanks for pointing out the bad inaccuracy of the reporter's list of "cases in which the Supreme Court has decided Acts of Congress to be unconstitutional," given in Part A of the Appendix to volume 131 of the United States Supreme Court Reports. In speaking of the omissions in the list, Mr. Coxe remarks that of the *Dred Scott* case. There are reasons for omitting that case to which he does not advert, but there was at least as much reason for inserting it as in the case of two or three others that are there.

Mr. Coxe is sometimes whimsical, and sometimes his comments are hardly those of a lawyer; his style of expression is here and there quite eccentric, and he repeats himself; he is sometimes guilty of squeezing his grapes too hard; and sometimes he gives his reader too little credit for intelligence, and spins out his exposition too much. But the book is still the work of a man of extraordinary intelligence, learning, accuracy, and thoroughness, — a helpful and illuminating book, — and it will be received with grateful appreciation by careful students of constitutional history and law.

J. B. T.

DIGEST XLVII., 2. DE FURTIS. WITH TRANSLATION AND NOTES BY C. H. MONRO, M. A., Cambridge, England: University Press. 1893. 12mo, pp. vii, 128.

The text, translation, and notes, in distinctive type run together on the pages, each comprising about a third of the book. The attempt is to present the sources as such to students, so that many doubts are left unsolved and most words of art left untranslated, rather than that the translator should do the students' work, or destroy by translation the connotation of words which have no accurate English equivalent. The notes give references to other sources and other parts of the Digest.

It is gratifying that the revival of the study of the civil law in England should bring such careful and scholarly work as its latest fruit. Certainly a translation done in this manner of those parts of the Digest which bear by analogy on our modern law would do much towards removing the present lack of interest in this body of famous jurisprudence, which might well furnish the profession with both analogy and argument. This is a good precedent, and will be an example to those who follow it, of the way in which the work should be done.

R. W. H.

LEGAL STUDIES IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD. A Valedictory Lecture by James Bryce, D. C. L. Macmillan & Co., 1893.

Though the chief interest of this address must be for members of the University of Oxford, it will be read in this country also with the same pleasure and profit which the other writings of Professor Bryce have afforded. The main emphasis is laid on the importance of the civil law, a study of which he believes should be included by the student in his preparation for the practice of the common law. A hint at the position of university legal studies in England is given by the regret expressed at the fact that the men after receiving their B. A. degree do not enter the law school for professional legal studies as they do in America.

E. B. B.